REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 were pending as of the date of the current office action. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. These amendments are supported by the specification, including at Figure 2 page 20, line 16 through page 21 line 24, and page 34, line 10 through page 35 line 19. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,151 to Albeck et al. (hereinafter "Albeck").

Applicants respectfully traverse the grounds for rejection and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-25 in view of the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Independent claims 1, 13, and 20 recite features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited reference. For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. As discussed below, the cited reference (Albeck) neither expressly nor inherently teaches the features of the claimed invention.1

Claim 1 of the application includes "a processing portion adapted to perform calculations of a proximity analysis." This proximity analysis is a proximity analysis of modeled objects in a design.

This element is not found in Albeck. As the examiner points out, Albeck discloses "an texture section analyzer operative to analyze texture of the overlap section." (Albeck column 2, lines 21-22). However, this overlap section analyzer does not perform a proximity analysis. In Albeck, the proximity of objects in a design is never at issue. In fact, there is only one object in Albeck. (Albeck column 2, lines 15-19). Therefore no proximity between objects is calculated, as is described in Claim 1 of the application.

Additionally, in the cited portion of Albeck the examiner found relevant to the claimed processing portion adapted to perform proximity analysis, the texture of an overlap section of the object (from two views of the single object) is analyzed. (Albeck column 2, lines 20-31). Thus the texture already exists on the object in Albeck to be analyzed. In

1 Additionally, Albeck does not motivate any modification of its teaching to yield these features, and so a §103 obviousness rejection would also be inapposite.

Claim 1 of the application, however, a "coordinates relating to the texture *to be rendered onto the objects* in the design" are being provided by a texture coordinates generator portion. Thus, in Albeck, a texture which exists is being analyzed, while in contrast, in the invention, a texture is being newly rendered onto the objects. The Albeck reference is therefore inapposite.

Additionally, Claim 1 of the application includes a rendering portion which provides renderability of a texture onto the objects, where the texture visually indicates the spatial relationship between the objects. This element is also not found in Albeck. A "fixed random texture pattern" may be generated for an object in Albeck. However, Albeck stresses that this is a random pattern, stating that "due to the random nature of the texture pattern, [the use of texture generators] does not interfere with or influence the operation of the system..." (Albeck column 5, lines 53-67). Thus Albeck in fact teaches away from a texture containing information (such as a visual indication of the spatial relationship between objects) instead of a random texture.

Claims 13 and 20 include features similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1, and are patentable for at least the same reasons. As to Claim 13, the examiner cites back to the treatment of Claim 1. Applicant again stresses the lack in Albeck of "proximity analysis of objects in a design" and the "visible display of said performed texture based proximity analysis."

As to Claim 20, Applicant again reiterates the above arguments. In discussing Claim 20, the examiner has cited to Albeck, column 13, lines 56-60. This section of Albeck discusses the use of color to show the deviation between a reconstructed object and the CAD model of an object. Only one modeled object is present in the design and it is being compared an imaged object. Two objects in a design are not being examined to compute a proximity analysis. Additionally, no texture-based view of proximity is found in Albeck. Again, the only texture found in Albeck is that which is analyzed from views of an object (Albeck column 2, lines 20-22) or that random texture pattern which may be projected onto an object (Albeck column 6, lines 53 – 62). Thus the elements of this claim are not found in Albeck.

Based on the foregoing, claims 1, 13, and 20 and all claims dependent from those claims should not be rejected as being anticipated by Albeck. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the office action and an early notice of allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Sharon Fenick at (215) 568-3100, to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: June 12, 2003

Sharon Fenick
Registration No. 45,269

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439